



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hobbes, with whom the history of English moral science is usually supposed to begin, published his "Leviathan" nearly half a century later than the appearance of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning"), we cannot but be deeply impressed by the originality, the clearness, and the suggestiveness of his treatment of the subject, and may with good reason add to his other honors the title of the Father of English Moral Philosophy.

MICHAEL MACMILLAN.

WAR AND SOCIAL ECONOMY.

In the so-called "glorious" victories of Cæsar, a million men perished on the field of battle. Napoleon, in the short space of nine years, was authorized to devote to "the glory of France" 2,103,000 of her sons. In the ten years following the attack on Fort Sumter, the world destroyed in war 1,400,000 lives and six billions worth of property. Two thirds of the combined budgets of the various states of Europe are devoted to the maintenance of armed forces, and to the service of a debt practically the whole of which was incurred by wars.¹ War expenses in Europe absorb one-half of all the wealth created by productive labor. In the comparatively insignificant war of England with the Boers, England lost 22,450 men and spent \$1,400,000,000. Three hundred and fifty thousand men were withdrawn by her from productive industry to engage in the destruction of war. Military expenditures in the United States during the last eight years have absorbed \$1,500,000,000, more than enough to pay the national debt and dig the Panama canal!

War, then is alarmingly expensive. Unless indispensable as a means of preserving national integrity, the outlay is likely to exceed the income. But war, as a rule, is not indispensable. As a rule its causes are trivial. Its object to-day is usually commercial: it is waged for markets. War, therefore, is a phase of industrial competition, or it is rather industrial com-

¹ De Molinari, "The Society of To-morrow," p. 30.

petition writ large. Armies and navies are the effective instruments for opening doors to business enterprise. Their employment, however, is the superlative example of social waste. The question of their increase or enlargement is a question of social economy.

Now, it is not necessary, nor would it be correct, to regard all the losses of war as absolute waste. We may admit that war is sometimes necessary. As long as men regard the accumulation and sale of goods as the chief end of man, it probably will be unavoidable. It may sometimes result in "the stainless victories of immortal truth." It doubtless stimulates invention, and encourages the development of certain desirable qualities, such as courage, endurance, and the ability to act in concert.

But for all that, war is waste. For the question is not, Is any good derived from war? There is probably no form of national expenditure, no evil, to which some benefit may not be traced. "Evil," says Lowell, "its errand hath, as well as Good." The question is one of good relatively to cost. Do warlike expenditures bring as great a return as they would if applied in some other direction? Are the benefits derived from war worth the price paid for them? Might not the qualities of devotion, courage, etc., be developed at less expense, and without unchaining all the brutal passions? Put in this way, the question has but one answer: War is waste; for the test of waste is what might be done with the same means most wisely expended.

Suppose, for instance, that England had employed the men and the money devoted to the war in South Africa to beautify her cities, to develop her physical resources, or to educate her people; how much greater would have been the return in human well-being, both to herself and to the world? She might have made herself supreme in science and in art, an example and an inspiration, a light to the feet of all nations that would tread the path of peaceful progress. What has she to show for them? She has mastered, to be sure, an infant republic, and exhibited to the world the loyalty of her subjects; but at the same time she has conjured up, at home and abroad, the spirit

of militancy which, like Banquo's ghost, may not down, and has sown in South Africa the dragon's teeth of suspicion and hatred which later on may spring up, armed warriors that will humble her pride.

Suppose, again, that the United States had turned its expenditure for war to the direct promotion of the pursuits of peace. Can anyone doubt that the benefit to the country would have been immeasurably greater? Cut the estimated war expenses of the last eight years in two, and there would still be enough to construct the Panama Canal, according to the original estimate, and to secure the great increase in commerce it is expected to bring; to irrigate a large part of our arid lands and make homes for thousands of people where now is a barren waste, and to educate the 3,720,000 children in the country, now said to be without educational privileges; or, if devoted to the science of preventive medicine, it would have lengthened the average of human life, and have brought health and happiness into thousands of homes where now is disease and despair. Preventable disease kills hundreds of thousands of people every year. The greatest enemy this country ever had is the small form of life that brings the hectic flush to the cheek of the consumptive. One hundred and sixty thousand annually fall before this implacable foe. What wisdom is there in spending millions to protect our coasts from an anonymous enemy, and practically nothing to protect the lives and health of the people? Would it not be wiser and more becoming in a Christian nation, to say nothing of economy, to spend money in trying to save life than in expensive preparations to destroy it?

Observe, too, that the economic losses of war do not tell half the story. There remain the ethical and moral losses—the debasement of character, the hatred engendered, the sorrow and suffering inflicted upon the helpless and the innocent, and all the other evils incident upon war.

Now, in spite of the waste connected with war and military expenditures, obvious enough when relative values of expenditure are considered, patriotic and conscientious men, both at home and abroad, are urging a still larger outlay. Germany

wants a larger navy. England wishes to increase her army. In this country the appeal for a larger navy is continuous and strong. The solicitude of the President in regard to a "big navy" is well known. Secretary Bonaparte, in his recent annual report, asks Congress to add thirteen warships to the navy at a cost of \$23,300,000. Newspapers of varied influence second this appeal, and insist that we must have a navy consistent with our advanced position as a world power.

The question whether this request for a larger navy should be granted is, I repeat, a question of social economy. It is this, Is the adding of warships to our navy the best opportunity now open to the Government to conserve and increase the welfare of the nation?

This question might be answered in the affirmative (we may grant it for the sake of the argument) if our navy were now of inconsiderable strength. But this is not the case. Congress has already responded to the popular demand in a most liberal manner. The naval estimates for the present fiscal year were the largest ever submitted, and they were cut down from those sent in by the bureaus more than \$17,000,000. During the past year we launched more war-vessels than ever before by this or any other nation. We have now in commission 157 warships, to say nothing of torpedo boats, tugs, sailing and receiving vessels. We have under construction 47 war-vessels, 14 of which are first-class battleships, and the construction of two more, at a cost of fifteen million dollars has been authorized.² Is not this liberal naval expenditure for a nation "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"? Shall we continue this form of expenditure when there are so many other avenues in which the public revenue may be directed with unquestionable benefit to the people? We have 10,000,000 poor whose health and happiness, and consequent usefulness, might be greatly enhanced if Congressional liberality should take the form of more liberal expenditure for internal development—sanitation, agriculture, forestry, irrigation.

² These facts concerning the navy are from the "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy for the year 1904."

Before expending another seven-and-a-half millions in the construction of a war-vessel, then, popular representatives would do well to consider the probable income if that sum were expended in other directions. What might be done of public value with that amount of money? Suppose, for instance, that it were invested in education. The average cost of a schoolhouse in the South is about \$275, and the average wages of the teacher is about \$25 a month. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars, the cost of the best type of warship, would build over 27,000 schoolhouses, or employ over 37,000 teachers for a school year of eight months. It is more than half as much as the total expenditure for the public schools of the South Atlantic States in 1903. There are but a few universities in the United States with an endowment of \$7,500,000. Is a battleship worth more to the country than a university? There are little colleges in our land, struggling along with an endowment of less than a million, that are worth more to the nation than any war-vessel that ever was built. They have made men, and a man is worth more than a man-of-war. There is really no comparison between the value of money spent in building fighting ships, which, anyhow, are soon out of date and must go to the scrap-heap, and money spent for education.

Instead, therefore, of increasing our sea-power by strengthening our navy, we should, for one thing, increase our brain-power by strengthening our schools. Brains are worth more than battleships. A good school is better than a fort, and the best army a nation can have is an army of intelligent school-teachers. The true greatness of our nation depends upon the intelligence and character of our people. These in turn depend upon education. Yet while we are expending annually on the common schools about \$250,000,000, we are spending as much on war. "At the present rate of expenditure on the army and navy," said the late Edward Atkinson, "in the year 1905 the amount will not be less than \$265,000,000, probably more." What more striking example of social waste could be found? Two hundred and fifty million dollars to put brains into people, and two hundred and sixty-five million dollars to blow them out!

What, now, is the justification of, and plea for, additional expenditure upon the navy?

We may pass without serious consideration those ebullitions of spurious patriotism to the effect that we must have the largest navy in the world. It is a childish, not to say a barbarous, delight that is found in that sort of superiority. Our navy is now fifth in point of size. When the present constructive program is completed it will be third. Suppose we make it first, how long should we enjoy the distinction of holding the first rank without renewed expenditure to increase the size of our navy beyond the increase of some rival nation? If it is wise for us to seek to be first, will not other nations think it is so for them? That is one of the worst things about the expansion of our navy; it evokes the spirit of rivalry and war. It puts an excuse for increasing military burdens into the mouth of every despot in the world. It makes tyranny easier and liberty less secure. The influence of the United States for good or evil is the most potent of all nations. It should be cast on the side of industrialism and against militarism, in favor of peace and not in favor of war. We should teach to other nations, by example, as well as precept, that our work is constructive rather than destructive; that to disarm is better, and more economical, than to arm. As Lowell wrote:

"Our country hath a gospel of her own
To preach and practice before all the world,—
The freedom and divinity of man,
The glorious claims of human brotherhood,
Which to pay nobly as a freeman should,
Gains the sole wealth that will not fly away,—
And the soul's fealty to none but God."

A significant effect of our example in naval construction may now be observed where perhaps least expected. The South American republics have become suspicious of our intentions, and are increasing their armaments. Brazil has recently appropriated \$60,000,000 for the construction of forty new war-ships. Argentina is negotiating with Chile for the abrogation of the protocol limiting the naval armaments of these two countries. When republics arm against a republic Liberty must

weep. We owe a debt of consideration to the republics on this continent which a large navy tends to make us forget. He is blind indeed who does not see that the swaggering patriotism and rodomontade indulged in by some of us since we became "a world power" cannot promote among them a feeling of friendliness for us. Assumptions of physical or moral superiority, sneers at the peculiarities of their people, ridicule of their pretensions, the cheap wit indulged in at their expense by pert paragraphers of the press, even though more thoughtless than malicious, can have no other result than to intensify prejudice and develop hatred all the more bitter because impotent. It would be worse than social waste, it would be a lasting shame and a crime, if by an arrogant spirit encouraged by a large navy, or by a lack of conciliatory diplomacy, we should provoke to hostility the struggling young republics we have guaranteed to protect against European aggression. But even this is possible if we follow the policy of enlarging our navy. Who knows but that a war, possibly the next great war, may take place between the Mother of Republics wedded to militarism, and a combination of her children, the offspring of Liberty?

The mere desire for a big navy, however, and the satisfaction derived from it, are not put forth as arguments with expectation, we may suppose, of greatly influencing the thoughtful citizen. It may do for the "jingo"; it is not sufficient for men who think. For these another argument is advanced.

This other argument is that a big navy is our best insurance against war. This implies, of course, that peace is maintained through fear, the fear of the nations with smaller armaments, which is not always the case. Few nations avoid a war because they are afraid. The men who plunge a nation into war do not do the fighting, hence they are not overawed by superior force. But granting to this contention all the weight that properly belongs to it, let us look more closely at this argument that the larger the navy the less likely we are to be involved in war.

A large navy requires a large force of men and officers to man it. When the ships now authorized are completed we shall have in our navy over 62,000 men and more than 2,000

officers. These men and officers are in the navy either because of an adventurous, thoughtless and irresponsible spirit, or because they believe in war. It is charitable to suppose the latter. The officers at least are persuaded that war is beneficent, and they are anxious to rise in their profession. Now, how long do you suppose these officers and men, wishing for an opportunity to distinguish themselves, will be content with inglorious idleness? Will they "not only be willing but anxious to fight?" They will be scattered over the world, in frequent contact with the "fighting men" of other nations. An insult to themselves will be interpreted as an insult to "the flag," which they must avenge. Experience has shown that a drunken sailor can stir up more trouble than sober men can easily adjust. When some men anxious to fight come in contact with others of the same mind trouble is likely to ensue. Assuming that every man and officer is a gentleman, the larger their number the more numerous the points at which international disputes may arise. How many wars have been provoked by the action of soldiers. The war with Mexico, for instance, according to General Grant ("Memoirs," I, 51), was "provoked by the army if not by the annexation itself."

A large navy, then, instead of being a war preventive is a war provocative; instead of being insurance against war, it is the next thing to assurance of war. Arms beget arrogance, and arrogance embroilment. This is recognized as true of the individual. It is true also of the nation. Our best insurance against war is justice, fair dealing, modesty, moderation, courteous consideration of the rights and claims of other nations, and charity for their weaknesses. It is not the policy of the "big stick." A nation should not undertake, any more than a man, to punish every fancied slight, to whip everybody that offers it an insult, or to resent with physical force every injury received. Our nation professes to have some regard for the teaching of Him who said, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that spitefully use you, and persecute you." This may be an impossible ideal. Nevertheless true patriotism consists in the desire, the will, and the act to raise the standard of

national conduct to conform a little more closely to this ideal, and not in talking of the necessity of war, and burdening the people with military expenses.

War, then, may be truly considered as waste. Social economy demands that the vast stream of revenue which has hitherto been flowing out upon the sands of war, where it is drunk up unproductively and lost, should be directed out over the fields of education and peaceful industry, to fertilize the soil and cause it to produce in ever increasing abundance the flowers and fruit of a higher civilization.

IRA W. HOWERTH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

REFLECTIONS ON KIDD'S "PRINCIPLES OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION."

Although Mr. Kidd's book has now been before the public for some little time, and various criticisms have been passed upon it, it would not seem out of place to revert again to a consideration of its main features, particularly as the subject-matter dealt with is, and is likely to continue to be of engaging interest to all who concern themselves with the study of social phenomena. It is intended in the following pages to take an independent and impartial review of the arguments presented, with the sole purpose of discovering how far they are adequate to support the author's theory, and therefore how far the theory itself is to be relied upon.

The first impression, I imagine, which the reading of the first few chapters of the book makes upon the mind of anyone to whom this class of literature appeals is that, whatever may be the value of the argument one way or the other, he is in the presence of a highly fascinating problem and one which, as the author is constantly reminding us, is entitled to "hold the imagination." As we read on, the mind is still held under the grasp of the same spell, and although it may find some difficulty in endorsing the argument put forward on behalf of the theory of the entire "subordination of the present to